UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/080,461	05/19/98	ASAMA	H	P619-93US0

WM01/0418

JACOBSON PRICE HOLMAN & STERN
400 SEVENTH STREET N W
WASHINGTON DC 20004

EXAMINER
JOSEPH, T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	13

DATE MAILED: 04/18/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

1- File Copy

Office Action Summary

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _Mar 12, 2001_

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_ 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ 3 __ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim 12 – 19

☒ Claim(s) _1-5, 12-15, and 17-19_ is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _12-15, 17 and 18_ 17 – 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) _1-5 and 19_ 16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 1-28-2001 and 3-12-2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram (pat. # 5,948,064) in view of Hopkins (pat. # 5,757,918).

Claim 1 is rejected. Bertram teaches accessing a computer by an administrator (fig. 9); such a computer must be provided with an operating environment and a user recognizing unit such as a computer coupled with appropriate processor for processing logon commands. Bertram teaches software for determining an authorized user that can be interpreted as requiring an information storage medium to be applied to the user recognizing unit (fig. 9). Bertram teaches a system which includes an information storage medium storing a user environment information about environment suitable for a user, and the user recognizing unit reads the user-environment information stored in the information storage medium and changes the operating environment of the computer so as fit with the user-environment information (col. 10, lines 38 - 65). Bertram

teaches user authentication which translates into a process that requires a data server storing user-environment information corresponding to user identification information identifying users (col. 4, lines 34 - 65). Bertram fails to teach an information storage medium being portable wherein the information storage medium stores user-environment information about environment suitable for a user.

Hopkins teach a method for personalizing a smart card, a type of removable medium, for maintaining security information (fig. 1; col. 15, lines 15 - 60). Security information is used for setting an environment suitable for a user. It is obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an information storage medium which is portable wherein the information storage medium stores user environment information about the environment is suitable for a user. Doing so enables each user to access needed applications in a timely manner while preventing unauthorized or unnecessary access to unneeded applications.

Claims 4 is rejected. Bertram teaches the use of a non-native OS based environment which translates into a type of OS, a language in which information is to be displayed, for controlling usable applications software while interfacing with the layout of the keyboard (fig. 2). Betram makes reference to a Windows NT system which uses a keyboard as one of its input devices (col. 4, lines 34 - 57).

Claim 5 is rejected. Bertram teaches the use of an ID card, a type if computer readable medium, containing a password (col. 6, lines 35-51).

Claim 16 is rejected. Bertram teaches a machine referring to a computer, user information

referring to user identification information identifying the user, and user setting information

referring to user-environment information (col. 10, lines 38 - 65).

4.   Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertram

(pat. # 5,948,064) view of Hopkins (pat. # 5,757,918) as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and

further in view of Dedrick (pat. # 5,710,884).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected. Betram fails to teach use of an ID card with computer

readable information which can be translated as a portable information storage medium. Dedrick

teaches the use of an ID card with computer readable information which can be translated as a

portable information storage medium (col. 6, lines 23 - 67). The information unit is separate from

the user recognizing unit. The recognizing unit is the processor and associated systems for

determining legitimacy of input while the medium can be any removable id or disk. The said ID

card is separate from the user recognizing unit. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an ID card with computer readable

information which can be translated as a portable information storage medium because doing so

allows for authorize customized access to computer systems while reducing database

requirements for the said computer systems.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's response filed 1-16-2001 have been fully considered. The Applicant request

reconsideration of claims 1-5 and 12-19 while canceling claims 6-11. The Applicant fails to

provide a response which is understandable to one with ordinary skill in the art.

        The Applicant asserts that the patentable features of claim 1 include a portable information

storage medium, an information storage medium for storing user environment information suitable

to the user, and a user recognizing unit that reads the user environment information stored in the

information storage medium and changes the operating environment of the computer so as to fit

with the suer environment information. The Applicant asserts that the commuter by Bertram

depends on communication between and client and server. The Examiner asserts that the

Applicant attempts to argue the claims using language that is beyond the scope of the claims. The

Applicant further asserts that Hopkins and Bertram are substantially different from the invention

contained in the invention. The Applicant makes reference to a data carrier in page 5 of his

argument but fails to fully describe the meaning of the said data carrier. Further, the claim

language makes no reference to the said data carrier. The Examiner asserts that Hopkins and

Bertram can be interpreted as teaching claim 1 of the invention of the said applicant.

        Due to at least the above reasons, the rejection of claims 1-5 and 12-19 remains standing.

6.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Thomas Joseph whose telephone number is (703) 305-2277. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 pm to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

John Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-6606.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

tjj/4-11-2001

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173